

12/23/69

Mr. Milton Brener
National Bank of Commerce Bldg.,
New Orleans, La.

Dear Mr. Brener,

My attention has been drawn to the references to me in your book, pages 55 and 162. Both are fictitious.

It is a matter of indifference to me that you say I agree with only the Commission's conclusion that the President was murdered in Dallas and nothing else in the Report. This cannot come from an intelligent man's reading of my work and it is utterly false. The fact is I draw heavily on the Commission. The one of my books you cite, and eight had been published, four for general distribution, before yours appeared, comes almost without exception from the Commission's published materials.

Your second reference, an unadulterated lie, makes clear why you failed to respond to my second letter. I have never met with both Garrison and Lane and planned anything. I have been with the two of them but a single time, for dinner in April 1967. I have never made any effort to get any information from Martens, and I am reasonably confident I never made any effort to get any information about him. He has never interested me that much.

What you have done is to contrive a probably safe libel. This leaves me no choice but to accept this as a measure of your character, for whatever that may mean, especially since you knew the truth before your book appeared. The truth is that your client sought me out for the purposes I have already informed you about. Fortunately, there was someone else with me when he phoned. I was suspicious, particularly when he phoned back and said he was speaking to me despite your objections and at the same time I heard a noise at my door. Upon going out I saw a man of Jack Martin's appearance disappearing. What these two were cooking up perhaps you know, but you certainly should know better than to trust them. Martin was no intermediary. Martens phoned me twice. The first time he persisted in talking after I told him he should not speak to me without your assent. He phoned again without it and sought my aid in copping a plea. Rather than the rubbish you have here, when I mentioned it to Garrison the next day, he said he'd speak only to you or in your presence, I do not recall which. However, I do have contemporaneous memos and motel bills, and I was not there 10 days at that time.

At this point you report you represent or then represented Walter Sheridan. Then it may interest you to know that one man spent six hours giving me details of how he said Sheridan did try to bribe him, all on tape with the on-off control under his control. Not fewer than three other persons confirmed various parts of his account.

In support of this effluvia I quote your "sources" from page lx:

"Chapter 13. This chapter is based largely on my own recollections as reinforced by the official records of charges made against Mertens and the transcript of his questioning by the District Attorney's Office."

Why do you omit your dreams or the nightmares of the motley crew you represent?

It was a great tragedy when the President was assassinated. In some ways what has transpired since is an even greater one. Had it not been for the complete, total and shameful abdication of your profession - those who staffed the Warren Commission and those of comfortable silence when the inexcusable was spread before them, beginning with the public and obvious denial of his rights to Oswald - this could not have happened. You persist, personally, in this ignoble tradition.

Lament a sick land. When those in whom sacred rights are entrusted live by such principles and beliefs, what can the future be?

There are those for whom sex is girls' magazines.

There are those who are Judenrat.

There are those whose lives prove your lawyer's maxim, "Penis erectus sciam non habet".

And, of course, there are those who live in glass houses.

Honor is for thieves when this represents lawyers, men who wrap themselves in the flag and proclaim their purposes noble.

Contemptuously,

Harold Weisberg